

HYDROTHERMAL SURFACE-WAVE INSTABILITY AND THE KURAMOTO-SIVASHINSKY EQUATION

R. A. Kraenkel, J. G. Pereira

Instituto de Física Teórica

Universidade Estadual Paulista

Rua Pamplona 145

01405-900 São Paulo SP – Brazil

M. A. Manna

Laboratoire de Physique Mathématique

Université de Montpellier II

34095 Montpellier Cedex 05 – France

Abstract

We consider a system formed by an infinite viscous liquid layer with a constant horizontal temperature gradient, and a basic nonlinear bulk velocity profile. In the limit of long-wavelength and large nondimensional surface tension, we show that hydrothermal surface-wave instabilities may give rise to disturbances governed by the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation. A possible connection to hot-wire experiments is also discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Thermocapillary dynamics in thin two-dimensional liquid layers, and in particular the convective instabilities of such flows have been a subject of much interest [1,2]. When the upper free surface of a planar liquid, bounded below by a rigid plate and above by an interface with a passive gas, is submitted to a temperature gradient, a corresponding gradient in the surface tension will appear which will produce motion in the bulk fluid. If a vertical temperature gradient is applied to a basic static state, convective motion sets in, a phenomenon called Marangoni convection. However, a horizontal temperature gradient may also give rise to instabilities, provided the basic state is not static [1]. These are the so called hydrothermal instabilities, which are a coupled effect produced by both temperature and velocity gradients. Smith and Davis [1,2] identified two such instabilities, which manifest themselves in the form of convection and surface-wave motion.

Our concern in this letter will be the study of the hydrothermal surface-wave instability. It has been shown in Ref. [1] that it is possible to have such instabilities characterized by a zero wave-number, provided the basic underlying flow is a nonlinear return flow. The long wavelength nature of the instability allows us to broach the problem by a long-wave perturbative analysis, where nonlinearity may be taken into account. By using the reductive perturbation method of Taniuti [3], we will show that, in the limit of large nondimensional surface tension, the waves originated by this instability turn out to be governed by the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation [4,5]. This equation has already been derived in different physical contexts [6]. In particular it has been obtained as the equation governing perturbations from a reference Poiseuille flow of a film layer on an inclined plane [7], also in the specific limit of large nondimensional surface tension [8]. However, in this case, the instability under consideration was hydrodynamical in nature, and not hydrothermal, as is the case considered in the present work.

The basic interest of the results presented in this work is concerned with recent experimental evidences for the existence of surface hydrothermal waves. For example, it has

been reported in the literature the observation of such waves in a cylindrical container [9]. Moreover, hot-wire experiments performed recently [10,11] have indicated the presence of propagative patterns. In the final section, we will speculate on a possible connection between our results and these experiments.

II. MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION

We consider a fluid layer of height d , bounded below, at $z = 0$, by a rigid perfectly insulating plate, and above, at $y = d + \eta(x, t)$, by a free deformable surface in contact with a passive gas of negligible density and viscosity. The liquid is characterized by a density ρ , thermal conductivity k , thermal diffusivity κ , unit thermal surface conductance h , and dynamic viscosity μ . To the free surface we associate a surface tension T , which will be assumed to depend on the local temperature θ according to the linear law

$$T = T_0 - \gamma (\theta - \theta_0) , \quad (1)$$

where γ is a positive constant, and T_0, θ_0 are reference values for surface tension and temperature, respectively.

We will be concerned with effects coming from thermocapillarity only. Therefore we will neglect gravity. This is a good approximation for a thin enough layer, or a layer in a microgravity environment. The equations governing the fluid motion are written as:

$$u_x + w_z = 0 , \quad (2)$$

$$\rho (u_t + uu_x + ww_z) = -p_x + \mu (u_{xx} + u_{zz}) , \quad (3)$$

$$\rho (w_t + uw_x + ww_z) = -p_z + \mu (w_{xx} + w_{zz}) , \quad (4)$$

$$\theta_t + u\theta_x + w\theta_z = \kappa (\theta_{xx} + \theta_{zz}) , \quad (5)$$

where the subscripts denote partial differentiation, u and w are, respectively, the x and z components of the velocity, and p is the pressure. On the upper free surface, these equations are subject to the following boundary conditions

$$\eta_t + u\eta_x = w, \quad (6)$$

$$p - \frac{2\mu}{N^2} [w_z + u_x(\eta_x)^2 - \eta_x(u_z + w_x)] = -\frac{T}{N^3}\eta_{xx}, \quad (7)$$

$$\mu [1 - (\eta_x)^2] [u_z + w_x] + 2\mu\eta_x(w_z + u_x) = N [T_x + \eta_x T_z], \quad (8)$$

$$\eta_x\theta_x + \theta_z = \frac{h}{k}(\theta - \theta_\infty), \quad (9)$$

with

$$N = [1 + (\eta_x)^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Equation (6) is the kinematic boundary condition, Eqs. (7) and (8) represent the normal and tangential stress balance at the upper free surface, and Eq. (9) is the equality of the heat flux at the interface, where θ_∞ is the temperature at $z \rightarrow \infty$. On the lower plate, the boundary conditions are

$$u = w = \theta_z = 0, \quad (10)$$

which characterizes the no slip and zero heat flux conditions.

Perturbation theory will be performed on a basic state of the system, defined by imposing to the infinite liquid layer a constant horizontal temperature gradient

$$\frac{d\theta_b}{dx} = -\beta, \quad (11)$$

with β a constant, which will give rise to a basic velocity profile in the bulk fluid. Moreover, we will assume a nonlinear velocity profile since, as remarked in Ref. [1], a linear flow profile is not susceptible to long-wave instabilities.

We now proceed to a nondimensionalization of the equations and boundary conditions. To this end, we take d as the unit of length, $\mu/\gamma\beta$ as the unit of time, βd as the unit of

temperature, $\gamma\beta$ as the unit of pressure, and T_0 as the unit of surface tension. In this process the following dimensionless numbers appear:

$$R = \frac{\rho\gamma\beta d^2}{\mu^2}, \quad \sigma = \frac{\mu}{\rho\kappa}, \quad B = \frac{hd}{k}, \quad S = \frac{\rho d T_0}{\mu^2},$$

where R is the Reynolds number, σ is the Prandtl number, B is the Biot number, and S is the surface tension number. In addition, we have also the Marangoni number M , which is defined by $M = R\sigma$.

The basic state, from which we will consider small disturbances, is the return flow solution to the Eqs.(2-10) which, in the limit $S \rightarrow \infty$, is given by:

$$u_b = \frac{3}{4}z^2 - \frac{1}{2}z \tag{12a}$$

$$w_b = 0; \quad p_b = \frac{3}{2}x \tag{12b}$$

$$\theta_b - \theta_0 = -x + R\sigma \left[\frac{1}{16} (1 - z^4) - \frac{1}{12} (1 - z^3) \right] \tag{12c}$$

$$\theta_\infty = -x; \quad \eta_b = 0. \tag{12d}$$

This solution has been obtained in Ref. [12]. It is exact in the limit of infinite surface-tension. However, in what follows we will consider S to be large, albeit finite. Accordingly, we should introduce corrections to Eqs.(12) up to some appropriate order of S^{-1} . These corrections, though, are of higher orders than those contributing to our calculations, except in Eq.(7). In this equation, the right hand side is proportional to S . To match orders correctly we make use of the basic solution η_b correct up to order S^{-1} , which is given by [12]

$$\eta_b = -\frac{R}{4S}x^3 + \frac{R}{16S}x.$$

It is important, at this point, to note that the range of validity of the basic solution is not arbitrary. As shown in Ref. [12], the largeness of S is connected to the largeness of the aspect ratio A , the ratio of the width of the layer to its depth. In fact, we must have $S \sim \mathcal{O}(A^4)$ as $A \rightarrow \infty$, so that we are not allowed to take $x \rightarrow \infty$ independently of S .

III. PERTURBATION THEORY

Let us consider the following perturbations to the basic state :

$$u = u_b + \epsilon (u_0 + \epsilon u_1 + \dots) , \quad (13a)$$

$$w = \epsilon^2 (w_0 + \epsilon w_1 + \dots) , \quad (13b)$$

$$p = p_b + \epsilon (p_0 + \epsilon p_1 + \dots) , \quad (13c)$$

$$\theta = \theta_b + \epsilon (\theta_0 + \epsilon \theta_1 + \dots) , \quad (13d)$$

$$\eta = \eta_b + \epsilon (\eta_0 + \epsilon \eta_1 + \dots) , \quad (13e)$$

where ϵ is a small parameter. Next, we introduce the slow variables according to

$$\xi = \epsilon (x - ct) , \quad (14)$$

$$\tau = \epsilon^2 t , \quad (15)$$

and we suppose that the perturbations depend on (x, t) through (ξ, τ) only. We now make more precise the meaning of *large albeit finite* for S , by assuming that

$$S = \epsilon^{-2} \overline{S} , \quad (16)$$

with $\overline{S} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$.

We are able, at this point, to obtain an order by order solution to the problem by integrations in the z variable. At each order, the bulk equations and the boundary conditions at the bottom yield u, w, θ, p in terms of three arbitrary functions, which will be determined in terms of η_0 by the boundary conditions at the upper free surface. However, as we have four equations, a compatibility condition will arise at each order. Explicitly, at order ϵ^0 , we get:

$$u_0 = -\frac{3}{2}z\eta_0; \quad (17a)$$

$$w_0 = \frac{3}{4}z^2\eta_{0\xi}; \quad (17b)$$

$$\theta_0 = R\sigma \left[\frac{z^3}{4} + \left(\frac{1}{2B} - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right] \eta_0; \quad (17c)$$

$$p_0 = -\frac{\bar{S}}{R}\eta_{0\xi\xi}. \quad (17d)$$

From Eqs. (6) and (8), we get as the compatibility condition at this order

$$c = -\frac{1}{2}. \quad (18)$$

At the next order, the relevant solutions are

$$u_1 = \frac{R}{32} (z^4 - 4z^3) \eta_{0\xi} - \frac{\bar{S}}{2R} z^2 \eta_{0\xi\xi\xi} + zf, \quad (19a)$$

$$w_1 = -\frac{R}{160} (z^5 - 5z^4) \eta_{0\xi\xi} + \frac{\bar{S}}{6R} z^3 \eta_{0\xi\xi\xi\xi} - \frac{z^2}{2} f_\xi, \quad (19b)$$

with $f = f(\xi, \tau)$ an arbitrary function. Also at this order, from Eq.(6), we have :

$$\frac{3}{4}\eta_{1\xi} + \frac{1}{2}f_\xi = -\eta_{0\tau} + \frac{5}{4}\eta_0\eta_{0\xi} + \frac{R}{40}\eta_{0\xi\xi} + \frac{\bar{S}}{6R}\eta_{0\xi\xi\xi\xi}. \quad (20)$$

From Eq.(8), we get:

$$\frac{3}{4}\eta_{1\xi} + \frac{1}{2}f_\xi = \frac{R}{4} \left(\frac{\sigma}{B} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \eta_{0\xi\xi} + \frac{\bar{S}}{2R} \eta_{0\xi\xi\xi\xi}. \quad (21)$$

Substituting into Eq.(20), we obtain an evolution equation for η_0 :

$$\eta_{0\tau} - \frac{5}{4}\eta_0\eta_{0\xi} + R \left(\frac{\sigma}{4B} + \frac{1}{10} \right) \eta_{0\xi\xi} + \frac{\bar{S}}{3R} \eta_{0\xi\xi\xi\xi} = 0. \quad (22)$$

Returning to the laboratory coordinates (x, t) , and remembering that $\bar{S} = \epsilon^2 S$ and $\eta_0 = \epsilon^{-1} \eta$,

Eq.(22) reads

$$\eta_t + \left(c - \frac{5}{4}\eta \right) \eta_x + R \left(\frac{\sigma}{4B} + \frac{1}{10} \right) \eta_{xx} + \frac{S}{3R} \eta_{xxxx} = 0. \quad (23)$$

Defining a new field by

$$\zeta = c - \frac{5}{4}\eta,$$

Eq.(23) becomes :

$$\zeta_t + \zeta\zeta_x + R\left(\frac{\sigma}{4B} + \frac{1}{10}\right)\zeta_{xx} + \frac{S}{3R}\zeta_{xxxx} = 0. \quad (24)$$

By a simple rescaling of variables, this equation can be written as

$$\zeta_t + \zeta\zeta_x + \zeta_{xx} + \zeta_{xxxx} = 0, \quad (25)$$

which is the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky (KS) equation in its standard form [4,5].

The linear analysis performed by Smith and Davis [1] can be recovered from Eq.(24) if we neglect the nonlinear term, and take

$$\zeta \sim \exp[\imath(\alpha x - \omega t)].$$

This leads to the dispersion relation

$$\omega = \imath \left[\alpha^2 R \left(\frac{\sigma}{4B} + \frac{1}{10} \right) - \alpha^4 \frac{S}{3R} \right], \quad (26)$$

from which we can see that the second derivative and the fourth derivative terms of Eq.(24) are, respectively, antidissipative and dissipative. Therefore there exists a critical point at the long wavelenght limit, given by $\omega = 0$, in which these terms compensate each other. In this limit, $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, and assuming that $S = \alpha^{-2}\overline{S}$, we obtain the critical Reynolds number

$$R_c = \left[\frac{\overline{S}}{3} \left(\frac{\sigma}{4B} + \frac{1}{10} \right)^{-1} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (27)$$

which is the result of Smith and Davis [1].

IV. DISCUSSION

The KS equation is a non-integrable equation, despite the fact that some exact solutions have been found [4,13]. Generically, the solutions to the KS equation are characterized

by the coexistence of coherent spatial structures with temporal chaos [14]. In particular, the search for a better understanding of the long wavelength properties of the KS equation has been intensively pursued lately [15]. And it is precisely in the long-wave limit that we have obtained the KS equation as governing hydrothermal surface-wave instabilities in a thin viscous layer of fluid with horizontal temperature and velocity gradients, and in the limit of large nondimensional surface-tension. This result could possibly be connected to a recent experiment [9] which has been performed to study the features of hydrothermal waves appearing when a cylindrical liquid layer is laterally heated. The existence of hydrothermal wave instabilities has been observed experimentally, and the results were found to partially agree with the previous theoretical predictions of Smith and Davis [1]. If we believe that, despite the difference in the geometry the results presented in Ref. [9] can somehow be considered as an approximation to the theoretical predictions, then the long-wave dynamics of the free surface described by the KS equation should play a role in the explanation of the propagative patterns observed in this kind of experiment.

At last, we would like to speculate on a possible connection between the results obtained in this letter and hot-wire experiments [10,11]. These experiments consist of a hot wire placed horizontally just below a free surface of a fluid. Above a certain critical value of the electrical power supplied to the hot wire, propagating patterns are observed. The existence of both horizontal temperature gradients and a basic velocity flow, as the fluid is convecting, makes contact with the theoretical setting in which hydrothermal waves show up. Of course, this is not enough to ensure that the above results can have an immediate application to the hot-wire experiments. However, since the system under consideration here presents similarities with the above mentioned experiments, they could help to elucidate the physical mechanism responsible for the observed propagative patterns. The idea to mimic features of a convecting fluid by a two-dimensional system with a velocity gradient has been examined by Roz  [16], based on data of an experiment with a much shorter wire [17]. However, this approach, which used a linear flow profile and linearized equations, turned out to be rather disappointing. In fact, as shown in Ref. [1], there is no long-wave instability in this case.

Only when a nonlinear return flow solution is supposed, which is indeed more appropriate for a closed system, long-wave hydrothermal phenomena appear. Therefore, we think it would be interesting to reexamine the ideas proposed in Ref. [16] for the hot wire problem in the light of the present results.

In summary, we have made in this letter a nonlinear analysis of the long wavelength hydrothermal instabilities, which can be considered as an extension of a problem first discussed by Smith and Davis [1] in a linear approximation. We have shown that the free-surface dynamics is governed by the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation, and that the previous results can be recovered from ours as a particular case.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Two of the authors (R.A.K. and J.G.P.) would like to thank Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), Brazil, for partial support.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. K. Smith and S. H. Davis, J. Fluid Mech. 132 (1983) 119 ; 132 (1983) 145.
- [2] S. H. Davis, Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech. 19 (1987) 403.
- [3] T. Taniuti, Suppl. Prog. Theor. Phys. 55 (1974) 1.
- [4] Y. Kuramoto and T. Tzusiaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. 55 (1976) 356.
- [5] G. I. Sivashinsky, Acta Astronautica 6 (1979) 569.
- [6] For a review, see : B. Nicolaenko, Physica D 20 (1986) 109.
- [7] A. Pumir, P. Manneville and Y. Pomeau, J. Fluid Mech. 135 (1983) 27.
- [8] G. I. Sivashinsky and D M. Michelson, Prog. Theor. Phys. 63 (1980) 2112 .
- [9] A. B. Ezersky et al., Phys. Rev. E 47 (1993) 1126.
- [10] J. M. Vince and M. Dubois, Europhys. Lett. 20 (1992) 505.
- [11] J. Burguete et al, Europhys. Lett. 23 (1993) 401.
- [12] A. Sen and S. H. Davis, J. Fluid Mech. 121 (1982) 163.
- [13] R. Conte and M. Musette, J. Phys. A: Math. and Gen. 22 (1989) 169.
- [14] P. Manneville, in *Macroscopic Modelling of Turbulent Flows*, ed. by U. Frisch, J. B. Keller, G. Papanicolaou and O. Pironneau, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol. 230, (Springer, Berlin, 1985).
- [15] S. Zalesky, Physica D 34 (1989) 427 and references therein; F. Hayot, C. Jayaprakash and C. Josserand, Phys. Rev. E 47 (1993) 911 .
- [16] C. Rozè, Ph.D. Thesis. Université de Rouen, France, (1989).
- [17] M. E. Weill, M. Rhazi and G. Gouesbet, J. Physique (Paris) 46 (1985) 1501 .